

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-22 are presently active; Claims 1-13 having been canceled by way of the present amendment without prejudice. Claims 14-22 have been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-4 and 6-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Petite et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,437,692). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petite in view of Naugle (U.S. Pat. No. 5,715,393).

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection, Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled, and the newly added claims do not correspond to Claims 1 and 5 which the Office Action had specifically identified as having deficiencies. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection has been overcome.

Presently, new Claim 14 defines a remote control server for controlling remotely electronic equipment connected via a firewall to an external network, which includes a wait state setting unit for receiving a command fetch request from the electronic equipment via the external network, and if a command execution request from a user terminal corresponding to the command fetch request is not stored, setting a wait state for the command execution request; and a command execution request transmission unit for receiving a command execution request transmitting from the user terminal via the external network, and transmitting the command execution request to the electronic equipment as a response to the command fetch request set to the wait state.

The remote control server of Claim 14 transmits the command execution request from the user terminal as a response to the command fetch request from the electronic equipment.

This allows remote control of the electronic equipment without complicated setting of the firewall. Further, upon receiving the command fetch request, the remote server sets a wait state for waiting a command execution request if the command execution request is not stored. This permits prompt transmission of the command execution request to the electronic equipment upon receiving it. It is therefore possible to suppress the delay occurring when transmitting the command execution request to the electronic equipment. Specifically, by setting the wait state, the server can transmit the command execution request to the electronic equipment before receiving the command fetch request transmitted periodically. The command execution request can be thereby transmitted immediately to the electronic equipment.

Independent Claim 19 defines a remote control method corresponding to Claim 14. Independent Claim 21 defines a remote control program product corresponding to Claim 14.

Regarding Petite et al, Petite et al disclose a remote control system (see Fig. 2) for controlling electronic equipment (a sensor/actuator) connected to a gateway 210 (which corresponds to a PC 3 of the present invention) with an external terminal (a computer 240 or a work station 250). The system includes a firewall 520 (see Fig. 5).

Naugle discloses a method for monitoring a remote computer using email (see Fig. 2).

The Office Action points out that, in the remote control system taught by Petite et al, a wait state for waiting a processing data transmission request exists during processing and analyzing the received data (Fig. 2, Col. 12, lines 42-65).¹ However, Petite et al do not disclose that the server therein sets a wait state for waiting a command execution request from a user terminal by receiving a command fetch request from electronic equipment, and upon receiving a command execution request from the user terminal, the server transmits the command execution request to the electronic equipment as a response to the command fetch request set to the wait state. Rather, in the remote control system taught by Petite et al, a server is not in a

¹ Office Action, page 4, lines 7-16.

Application No: 09/986,283

Reply to Office Action dated February 7, 2005

wait state for waiting a command execution request from a user terminal and therefore cannot immediately transmit the command execution request from the user terminal to the electronic equipment. Likewise, Naugle does not disclose or suggest this feature.


M.P.E.P. § 2143 requires for a *prima facie* case of obviousness that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. With no teaching in Petite et al or Naugle for this server feature, the references when combined fail to disclose or suggest such a feature. The remaining art of record (but not applied) has been considered but is deemed no more pertinent than Petite et al or Naugle, the applied references.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 14, 19, and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over the art of record.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
GJM:RAR:clh

I:\atty\RAR\amendments\215's\215812us\am.doc